

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
November 16, 2006**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Lee Madrid, David Scott Meade, Sally Promer-Nichols, Mery Velastegui, and David Wobker

STAFF PRESENT: Judd Black, Development Review Manager; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Nathalie Schmidt, Assistant Planner, Sarah Stiteler, Senior Planner, and Jeff Churchill, Assistant Planner.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:00 PM. Design Review Board members Dennis Cope and Robert Hall were excused.

MINUTES

October 5, 2006:

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WOBKER AND SECONDED BY MS. PROMER-NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 5, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED (2-0-2, WITH MR. MADRID AND MS. VELASTEGUI ABSTAINING).

DISCUSSION ITEM – Innovative Housing

Sarah Stiteler and Jeff Churchill presented a briefing on innovative housing and encouraged the Design Review Board members' participation in reviewing innovative projects on the five-member review panel of the three-year demonstration program. Two DRB members are required for the review panel, and Sally Promer-Nichols, David Scott Meade, and Mery Velastegui have expressed interest in being on this review panel. The first meeting will be held in May 2007. Two or three proposals are expected by November 15. Conover Commons was given as a good example of an alternative housing type, but the Board members were asked to wait for a Sunday afternoon open house to visit.

APPROVAL

L060448, Cleveland Street East

Description: Mixed-use development of approximately 115 flats and approximately 6,785 square feet of retail and commercial at street level

Location: 16025 Cleveland Street

Applicant Request: Approval

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

Applicant: William Johnson

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. The applicant has made all of the DRB-suggested changes. The Technical Committee requested that the applicant remove the columns that were in the sidewalk because of street widening and improvements. The applicant pushed the building back a bit and provided pilaster and corbels. Staff is recommending approval.

Chris Dowell, architect with Weber Thompson, 425 Pontius Ave #206, Seattle, WA 98109, presented clarifications. They showed more detail on the building and what the materials would look like on an

enlarged elevation. They provided the plant list to be used on this project. The materials to be used on the building would be concrete pilaster and cornice, above that Hardi-panel and Hardi-siding. They tried to set up a banding throughout the building and are trying to emphasize the colors. Hardi-trim that separates the top floor from the lower floors is a 12-inch-wide board and batten system. There would be Hardi-trim around the windows and Hardi-panel set within the floors. They would have fabric awnings along the retail portion. For the pickets, they had two similar but different examples. On the center part, they would use the simpler picket design without the horizontal bar; on the corner elements, the picket with the horizontal elements.

John Gaines with Intracorp confirmed that there would be a concrete band all the way around the elevations that would not be painted as they prefer the aesthetics of the raw, unfinished concrete. He said they would be using cast-in-place concrete; does not know if the sample on the materials board is representative—looks more gray than what they propose to use to look like that used on The Cleveland.

Judd Black, Development Review Manager, suggested the applicant use the Sack & Patch finish on the concrete that The Cleveland has.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Wobker:

- Confirmed with the applicant that there are awnings on the top floor.
- Commented that this is a very attractive building.
- Liked the color palette.
- Said he could not approve a building with this much Hardi-panel, especially the light color. There appeared to be five floors of uninterrupted Hardi-panel going up to the corners. (The applicant clarified that the Hardi-panel is only in the insets.) (Mr. Black suggested that a rougher finish might take the wobbling out.)

Ms. Velastegui:

- Preferred the creamy color for #10 and #17 on page 37. (Mr. Gaines replied that they would probably have one coat of paint on top of that concrete.) She noted the importance of mentioning in the approval what finish color the Board wants for the concrete.

Mr. Madrid

- Found an error on page 37, #15, which says brick but is a window. He confirmed that the height of the top rail banding is six inches, and probably a built-up piece of four inches with a top piece with metal coping.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Noted that there is a line missing under the sill of the windows, and the applicant agreed that one more level of detail should be added.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MR. MADRID TO APPROVE L060448, CLEVELAND STREET EAST, WITH CONDITIONS:

1. Building elevations for the building permit set shall be scaled at 1/8 inch and shall show all cladding materials. Additional details at 1/4 inch or larger may be required during building permit review to ensure that the cladding materials meet the designs standards for the district and expectations of this conditional approval.
2. The deviations from the following standards are approved per the plans reviewed by the Design Review Board April 6, 2006 per RCDG 20C.40.40-03 Administrative Design Flexibility:
 - a. Allow guest parking stalls to be counted toward parking requirement for retail uses.
 - b. Allow balconies to project closer than five feet to the property line (along 160th Avenue NE). The balconies would project up to the property line in some areas. Or allow deviation from the Privacy Standards (distance between windows facing each other) as shown on these plans if the street is vacated.

- c. Allow the modulation standards to be waived along the front with the use of architectural emphasis on prominent building corners.
- d. Allow patios to be less than five feet in width when double French doors or double sliding doors providing at least five feet of opening width are used on these smaller balconies.
- e. Allow the pilasters and the upper floors on the south elevation to project two feet into the minimum 14-foot setback from the BNSF ROW.
3. The materials and colors presented at this meeting shall prevail and follow the specifications on page 39 that mention cast-in-place concrete for the base.
4. Approve the cream color for the base and the element that is dividing the base of the building and the upper floors. All the cast-in-place concrete will be Sack & Patch finish. The concrete will match the cornice.
5. Presentation Materials Inconsistencies
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11x17-inch submitted drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement.

Motion carried (4-0).

Ms. Promer-Nichols requested that staff make sure that the piece under the windows top and bottom shows up.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WOBKER AND SECONDED BY MR. MADRID TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 7:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060061, 62 and 63 / Microsoft Buildings 86, 84, and 85

Description: The addition of mechanical screening

Location: 4854, 4514 and 4634 154th Place NE

Applicant: Taylor Hamblett for Building 86

Douglas Bailey for Building 84 and 85

Staff Contact: Nathalie Schmidt, 425.556.2471

Nathalie Schmidt, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report, explaining that the project scope is the addition of rooftop mechanical equipment and screening to three existing office buildings.

Mark Herman with nbbj, 130 Sutter Street, San Francisco, CA, 94920, representing the applicant on Building 86, showed images of the roofs as they look today and a roof plan that showed the locations of the mechanical units for Building 86. The colors proposed for the screening would match that building's finishes and distinguish it from Buildings 84 and 85.

Doug Bailey and James Walker, Collins Woerman, 710 2nd Ave, #1400, Seattle, WA 98104, representing the applicant on Buildings 84 and 85, showed some photos and computer renderings and drawings. The plan is to stay with the same horizontally-ribbed silver metal panels that match the existing penthouse enclosures on these two buildings.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Madrid:

- Had no problem with the screens as they were; thought this the best screen project he had seen.
- Liked the screen being incorporated into the mullions of the building.
- Liked the matte finish being gray to match the existing.

- Did not think the screens would be seen much at all.

Mr. Wobker:

- Agreed with Mr. Madrid.
- Thought the package was fine.

Ms. Velastegui:

- Thought there were two different cases. The gray will work for the one building. The other two could use a warm color to make a difference.
- Thought they should make other applicants do the same quality submittals.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thought the idea of placing the mullion up into the screen was brilliant and makes the screen look as if it is part of the building and not an add-on.
- Appreciated the packets.

The next step for the application is to get building permit approval.

SUSTAINABILITY

Ms. Promer-Nichols reported that she and Mr. Cope have attended three Sustainability Task Force meetings. The City is moving forward in adopting this by inventorying its programs using an ickle template. On the Design Review Board side, Mr. Cope is drafting a resolution for the Board to submit to City Council for review and approval. This way the City Council members would affirm their belief in sustainability. The hope is to have sustainability regulations so the Design Review Board and Planning will have reinforcement in getting people to incorporate sustainability into projects. Mr. Cope and Ms. Promer-Nichols recommend adding a sustainability award to the Design Awards. Mr. Cope will soon email the draft sustainability resolution to the Board members for review. The Design Review Board will work on the resolution at the next couple of meetings to finalize for the Council's review at the first of the year. Staff will prepare a Sustainability Checklist.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Transit Center Parking Garage

Greg Harry, KPG, 753 9th Avenue N, Seattle, WA 98109, provided four renditions of the garage building north elevation, plus the original proposal for comparison. The new designs included a stronger base and a light screen element that goes all around the building. Proposal #1 retained the green light screen treatment. Proposal #2 mimicked the store front treatment and used more of the profile material to function as a light screen and provide enclosure for the garage. Proposal #3 was a hybrid of Proposals #1 and #2 that overlaid the structure of the green support. Proposal #4 used the green screen painted black and used the same vertical support system floating in the openings. This provides more enclosure for the garage. They also provided an alternative screening trellis for the upper deck that was more whimsical.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Wobker:

- Liked the building better than the building going next to it.
- Hated to have this building hidden.
- Liked Proposals #1 and #4 because they look more substantial.
- Thought Proposals #2 and #3 would be fine if trying to make the building not noticeable.
- Liked the whimsical trellis—very clever.

Mr. Madrid:

- Said he leaned toward Proposal #4.

- Liked the simulated cornice.
- Suggested doing more experimentation.

Judd Black, Development Review Manager, commented that he thought Proposal #4 did not feel as if there was a top. He suggested taking a look at putting green with the screens.

Mr. Harry responded that they tried to make a departure on the north elevation.

Ms. Velastegui:

- Suggested adding one more trellis to break the long line as a top on Proposal #4.
- Liked the green screen but knew it did not work on this proposal.
- Agreed that something was missing on Proposal #4. (Mr. Harry responded that they did not want to suggest there was any sort of a people space up there. The client does not want that.) (Mr. Black suggested using a short trellis.)
- Liked Proposal #4 with finishing touch.
- Said she appreciated that they did the four variations.

(Mr. Wobker left the meeting at 8:40 PM.)

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thought that Proposal #4 had a lot of applied features.
- Thought there was a more honest expression in Proposal #3.
- Thought the mullion and tubular structures went a long way to break up the openness.
- Said she preferred Proposal #3.
- Did not want to be on the record as having a particular opposition but agreed that Proposal #2 was not acceptable.

Mr. Madrid:

- Did not like the green treatment on top; thought it a little much.
- Did not think Proposal #1 was acceptable in its current form.
- Suggested that the applicant return with Proposals #3 and #4 even though those probably need modification.

Mr. Black preferred Proposal #3 with a top, using coping to pick up the green below the tube structure.

There was agreement that the applicant should return with Proposals #3 and #4, both having a little more top, and that all liked the structural screen trellis.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MS. VELASTEGUI TO ADJOURN AT 8:50 PM. MOTION CARRIED (3-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY